

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Boy 1450 jnis 22313-1450 www.usping.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,937		07/12/2001	Richard Herbst	WWELL50.001AUS	2350
20995	7590	12/19/2003		EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET				HEITBRINK, TIMOTHY W	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614				1722	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary	09/904,937	HERBST, RICHARD					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
The SEASING DATE of this control of the	Tim Heitbrink	1722					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply in fix the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	is(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day: ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	thely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 No.	ovember 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This a	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 28-53 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-53</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the since a specific reference was included in the firs 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language pror 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic reference was included in the first sentence of the control of the first sentence of the control of the first sentence of the control of the control of the first sentence of the control of the con	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receives (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not receive priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(et t sentence of the specification or visional application has been receive priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120	on No Ind in this National Stage Ind. Ind.					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 1722

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36-50, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 36, line 13, "first smaller cavities" is indefinite since it is unclear what the cavities are smaller than. The Examiner suggests deleting ", smaller."

In claim 49, line 8, "first smaller cavities" is indefinite since it is unclear what the cavities are smaller than. The Examiner suggests deleting ", smaller."

In claim 52, line 6, it is unclear if the temperature controller is the same as or different from the controller found in claim 51. On line 7, the phrase "to regulate the injection molding machine at different temperatures adjacent the first and second separation planes" is indefinite since it is unclear if the temperature controller is adjacent the separation planes. The Examiner suggests amending claim 52 as follows: line 2, after "side" insert a comma; line 6, change "further comprising a" to —said—; line 7, delete "injection molding machine at different temperatures adjacent the"; line 8, after "planes" insert —at different temperatures—.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 1722

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by either Kotzab or Jung.

Kotzab discloses first and second mold portions having cooling channels 3, the mold portions defining a separation plane (shown with opposed arrows in Fig.1) where different areas of the separation plane at different temperatures due to the coolant heating along its path of travel.

Jung discloses a single die 5 having a number of loops at which different temperatures must be controlled. See column 1, lines 25-28.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorensen et al. in view of Shimizu et al.

Sorensen et al. in Figs. 14A-14L disclose the claimed invention with the exception of two injectors feeding the mold cavities.

Art Unit: 1722

Shimizu et al. teaches separate injectors to feed first and second mold cavities to be well known when injection molding a composite article. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide two injectors to feed the first and second mold cavities of Sorensen et al. as suggested by Shimizu in order to form a composite injection molded article.

Claims 36-48 and 50 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 52 and 53 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above claims define over the prior art since the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the injection molding apparatus having the first and second temperature control elements as well as the limitations found in claim 52 as proposed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim Heitbrink whose telephone number is 703-308-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 5:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Art Unit: 1722

Jun Matheak
Tim Heitbrink
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1722

Page 5

twh

Art Unit 1722 /ユー/2*ー0*3